1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	ANTHONY DEAN SLAMA,	Case No. 1:08-cv-00810-SKO
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER ON THE PARTIES' MOTIONS IN
12	v.	LIMINE
13	,	(Docket Nos. 180, 181)
14	CITY OF MADERA, et al.,	ORDER SETTING BRIEFING
15		SCHEDULE ON PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED MOTION FOR
16	Defendants.	BIFURCATION
17		
18		
19	On August 19, 2013, the Court conducted a hearing on the parties' motions in limine	
20	("MIL"). (Docs. 180, 181.) Plaintiff Anthony Dean Slama ("Plaintiff") appeared through his	
21	counsel, Andrew J. Fishkin, Esq. Defendants Officer Sheklanian and Officer Chavez (collectively	
22	"Defendants") appeared through their counsel, Gregory L. Myers, Esq. The Court issues the	
23	following rulings on the MIL and sets a briefing schedule on Plaintiff's proposed motion for	
24	bifurcation.	
25	A. Defendants' Motions in Limine	
26	On August 5, 2013, Defendants filed their MIL. (Doc. 180.) No opposition was filed	
27	The Court rules as follows:	
28		

- 2. **Defendants' MIL No. 2 -** The Court GRANTS Defendants' request to exclude non-party witnesses from the courtroom.
- **3. Defendants' MIL No. 3 -** The Court GRANTS Defendants' request to exclude references to police training, and notes that District Judge Ishii had previously decided this issue in the order granting in part and denying in part Defendants' motion for summary judgment. (*See* Doc. 122, 17:1-3.)
- **4. Defendants' MIL No. 4 -** The Court GRANTS Defendants' request to exclude evidence of any other complaint or lawsuit against Defendants or any other police department officer.
- **5. Defendants' MIL No. 5 -** The Court GRANTS Defendants' request to exclude expert opinions by non-experts, including Plaintiff. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's witnesses may not testify on matters that are within the purview of an expert witness.
- **6. Defendants' MIL No. 6 -** Defendants have WITHDRAWN their request to exclude photographs taken at the scene of the incident.
- **7. Defendants' MIL No. 7 -** The Court DENIES Defendants' request to exclude medical records pertaining to Plaintiff; however, Defendants may raise any objections at trial. Plaintiff is cautioned that if he seeks to introduce medical records, the evidence must comply with the admissibility requirements set forth in the Federal Rules of Evidence.

B. Plaintiff's Motions in Limine

- On August 5, 2013, Plaintiff filed his MIL. (Doc. 181.) No opposition was filed. The Court rules as follows:
- 1. Plaintiff's MIL No. 1 (numbered as 1) The Court GRANTS Plaintiff's request to exclude evidence or witnesses not previously disclosed during discovery and not identified in the pretrial order.

3. Plaintiff's MIL No. 3 (numbered as II and 3) - The Court GRANTS Plaintiff's request to exclude expert opinions by non-experts, including Defendants. Defendants and Defendants' non-expert witnesses may not testify on matters that are within the purview of an expert witness.

The Court had preliminary granted Plaintiff's request that Defendants appear "out of uniform," but Plaintiff has WITHDRAWN this request.

The Court GRANTS Plaintiff's request to exclude testimony regarding Plaintiff's criminal history. However, this ruling is subject to modification depending on purpose for which such evidence is sought to be introduced at trial. The Court ORDERS that, if Defendants seek to introduce any testimony or evidence regarding Plaintiff's criminal history, Defendants shall make this request during a break and outside the presence of the jury -- prior to the introduction of such evidence.

- 4. Plaintiff's MIL No. 4 (numbered as III and 4) The Court GRANTS Plaintiff's request to exclude evidence and testimony regarding Defendants' successful arrest and conviction of any other person. However, Defendants may introduce evidence of convictions as to Plaintiff's specific witnesses for the purposes of impeachment in accordance with the requirements of Federal Rule of Evidence 609.
- 5. Plaintiff's MIL No. 5 (numbered as IV and 4) The Court GRANTS Plaintiff's request to exclude Plaintiff's prior criminal history, subject to the terms as set forth in the ruling in Plaintiff's MIL No. 3. This MIL appears to be identical to Plaintiff's MIL No. 3 and is subject to modification depending on the evidence sought to be introduced at trial. As set forth above, any request by Defendants to introduce such evidence shall made to the Court during a break and outside the presence of the jury prior to the introduction of such evidence.
- **6. Plaintiff's MIL No. 6** (numbered as V and 5) The Court GRANTS Plaintiff's request to exclude the testimony of any undisclosed expert and, as stated above in the ruling on

1	Plaintiff's MIL No. 3, the Court GRANTS Plaintiff's request to exclude expert opinions b		
2	non-expert witnesses, including Defendants.		
3	C. Briefing Schedule for Plaintiff's Proposed Motion for Bifurcation		
4	During the motion in limine hearing, Plaintiff's counsel indicated that he is considering		
5	filing a motion for bifurcation.		
6	The Court provided the parties with its preliminary ruling on this matter and ORDERS th		
7	parties to meet and confer on this issue. Should Plaintiff decide to file a motion for bifurcation		
8	the Court SETS the following briefing schedule:		
9	Plaintiff's opening briefing shall be filed by no later than Wednesday, August 24, 2013		
10	at 12:00 p.m. (noon),		
11	Defendants' opposition brief shall be filed by no later than Thursday, August 25, 2013		
12	at 5:00 p.m.		
13	The motion will be deemed submitted at that time. No oral argument will be necessary		
14	unless requested by the Court.		
15			
16			
17	, IT IS SO ORDERED.		
18	Dated: August 20, 2013 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
19	OTHER STITLS MITOISTICITE VODGE		
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			